

Background:

- Chesapeake case study – another well is being fractured ¼ mile away. Our site is no longer suitable for scientific study. We need to find another site to proceed.
- Range case study – Range Resources has barred EPA from participating, but will work with DOE/NETL under certain conditions. (See attached draft MOU negotiated by DOE/NETL) The scientific value of study under current conditions is dubious, regardless of whether EPA participates. Other attachments outline the conditions necessary for a scientifically acceptable case study under two scenarios – (1) DOE/NETL only and (2) with EPA participation. Either would require further negotiations with Range Resources.

Issues:

- Should EPA proceed with prospective case studies?
 - Pros: Long run value to science and the report (with appropriate design and participation)
 - Baseline information (before HF)
 - Observe highest quality technology and procedures
 - Balances against charge that retrospective case studies are at places with prior complaints
 - Cons:
 - Timing: Neither case study approaches being ready to start. Under the best circumstances, results will not be available in time to inform the current ORD study.
 - Time/Staffing: Substantial work will be required to identify alternative location (Chesapeake) and negotiate workable solution, if that is possible at all (Range). Staff is already stretched very thin with Pavillion and retrospective case studies.
 - Funding: Dropping the case studies would free up more than \$500k/year which would provide significant relief to other HF research projects under the hard spending cap.